

### **REMARKS**

Claims 49-62, 65-71, 73 and 75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leroy. Claim 74 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leroy. Claim 63-64 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leroy in view of Lyberg. Applicants submit herewith their Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 to remove Leroy as a prior art reference. Applicants completed their claimed invention prior to the filing date of Leroy. Applicants filed their patent application before the Leroy patent issued. Therefore, Leroy is not prior art and cannot be the basis of a rejection. The rejections have been overcome and the claims should be allowed.

New claims 76-89 have been added to more accurately and completely claim a fuller scope of Applicants' invention. Claim 76 further distinguishes over Leroy, even if it were prior art, on the grounds a user may be prompted to provide search criteria and thereafter cause the display of one or more time slices of the at least one stimulus stream in response to submitting the search criteria. Leroy does not disclose such a search and display system or method. Indeed Leroy does not suggest an associative map that stores time slices of the stimulus stream that can be thereafter played back on the user display in response to search criteria.

Claim 77 also further distinguishes over Leroy with a correlator that produces a processor for digitally processing the stimulus stream as a digital signal. Claim 78 further adds the search and retrieval of time slices of the digital signal stimulus stream.

New claim 80 is directed to an apparatus that includes a correlator that correlates digitally stored time slices of the received stimulus signal with the response signal as a function of time to produce an associative mapping. As such, claim 80 and claims 80-89 depending therefrom more fully distinguish over Leroy.

Given the above considerations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider the new claims filed herewith. Applicants submit that all of the claims distinguish over the cited art and early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Application Serial No.: 10/821,750  
Response to Final Office Action of September 10, 2008  
Amendment dated: January 12, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 12, 2009

/Robert M. Asher, #30,445/  
Robert M. Asher  
Registration No. 30,445  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Bromberg & Sunstein LLP  
125 Summer Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
(617) 443-9292

02221/00103 993106.1